

MAILED NOV 21 1999
to
BEAU FRIEDLANDER

October 21, 1999

92

Dear Beau,

In closing, as it were, I'd like to cover a couple of points connected with our recent correspondence.

In my letter #87 (with a reminder in #88) I asked you for an explanation of the fact that you've told me certain things that have later turned out not to be true. For example, in your letter of 8/31/99, page 2, paragraph 1, you wrote, "there are no remaining legal issues with regard to the publication of Truth versus Lies," yet a few weeks later you asked for some very important additional legal edits, and it appears from your letter of 10/19/99, page 2, paragraph 2 (lines 5 and 6 from the bottom of the paragraph) that you are still insisting that those items be paraphrased or summarized. Yet you have not explained this discrepancy between your words of 8/31/99 and your subsequent action.

I'm willing to give you the benefit of the doubt and assume that you ^{wrote} ~~spoke~~ recklessly rather than dishonestly on 8/31/99. But you certainly did lie in your letter of 10/4/99 to Warden Pugh. On page 2, paragraph 3 of that letter you stated that Jeffrey Miller was my legal counsel on issues associated with the publication of the book. This is false and you know it. In fact, you wrote in your letter of 10/19/99, page 1, paragraph 2: "Miller and Korzenik represent Context Books, and

their responsibilities are limited to protecting [Beau Friedlander] from [a lawsuit, " and, page 2, paragraph 3, "[Miller] is not your lawyer." Moreover, it has been my understanding for some time that Miller would not be able to represent me, because his doing so would involve conflict of interest.

Though you told the above lie to Warden Pugh and not to me, the lie is potentially harmful to me, because after the authorities here learn that you have falsely told them that Miller was my counsel, when I later want a visit from some other lawyer who really is my counsel, he may have difficulty getting in to see me because the prison authorities will be suspicious of ~~the~~ the legitimacy of his relationship with me.

Also in your letter of 10/4/99 you wrote, "Mr. Dubner is currently trying to place the same article with Time Magazine. This depends only on permission from Mr. Kaczynski, which has been requested." This too is false. My permission was never requested for publication of Dubner's article in Time Magazine, nor did I ever give such permission.

In your letter of 10/19/99, page 2, paragraph 3, you point out that the "new issues", i.e. those having to do with a possible impact on my appeal, are not covered by the terms of our contract. You're

quite right. But it's also true that your lawyers' request for certain documents of mine is not covered by the terms of our contract. You'll recall that the "new issues" arose in response to your lawyers' request for the documents. I was asking for certain assurances (related to the "new issues") from you as a quid pro quo for giving your lawyers the documents. All this was external to the contract.

Actually, on the "new issues" I would have been willing to yield, if that had been necessary in order to get the book published and if things had been going alright in other respects. As I said during our conference call with Miller, Denvir, and Clarke, since I've put so much time and effort into this book, if I have to take a certain risk in order to publish it, then I'll take that risk. The risk is probably a moot question anyway, since everyone agrees that my chances of winning a new trial are very slim. Thus the real problem is not the "new issues" but the extensive revisions in Truth versus Lies that your lawyers demand and that, in my opinion, would seriously weaken the argument.

We both would have been better off if you had been completely frank with me from the beginning about the amount of material that your lawyers wanted to delete (or replace with summaries and paraphrases), and if you had

held off on the publicity until it had been definitely determined that we would be able to reach agreement on the legal revisions.

I would appreciate it if you would return my family photo. Best to send it to Quin, Denvir. Thanks.

Regards,

Ted